Divine Dialectical Emanationism (DDE): A Philosophical Treatise

“Rather than Sisyphus endlessly pushing a boulder up a mountain with a fixed peak, he would be far more happier knowing that there is no final limit—only continuous ascent shaped by his own choices. The peak will never trap him, nor will he regress;
he moves forward, forever growing, ever been better, ever been higher.”
Servideus Weissman von Yavaria

Abstract

Divine Dialectical Emanationism (*DDE*) —or Divine Asymptoticism, is a philosophical framework synthesizing critical theory, Islamic Sufistic metaphysics, and secular thought of dialectical reasoning. It seeks to resolve the limitations of purely materialist or theological models by proposing structured incompleteness—an asymptotic movement toward *the Reference*. Unlike deterministic or relativistic models, *DDE* allows for dynamic progression through history, integrating human agency and divine occasionalism. It aims to give a basis framework for both Theist and Secularist for the sake of dialectical progress.

Key influences include:

- **Neoplatonic Emanation**: Reality is structured hierarchically, with higher truths emanating downward.
- **Islamic Thought**: Al-Ghazālī’s critique of necessary emanation informs *DDE*’s rejection of rigid determinism and necessary flux of influence of Neo-Platonism. He also critiqued the works of closed Islamic metaphysical philosophy, arguing that mortal cannot fully comprehend the Divine, reinforcing *DDE’s* limits on human’s knowledge. The Mystical side of this model also heavily influenced by al-Junayd, al-Ghazali, and Ibn Arabi.
- **Lacanian Not-All**: No symbolic system fully encapsulates reality, reinforcing *DDE*’s structured incompleteness.
- **Žižekian Ideology Critique**: Political and ideological systems claim totality but are structured around inherent contradictions.

By integrating these perspectives, *DDE* provides a dialectical model where ethical and epistemological development occurs asymptotically.

1. **Introduction: The Problem of Incompleteness & Knowledge**
   The Limitation of Human Cognition

Men’s knowledge are inherently flawed. It cannot access something which beyond our system. These limitations are not merely one’s incapacity for a rational knowledge or their power of their mind, but it is an inherent feature of man’s existence in itself. We won’t be able to reach a finality of striving and refining our knowledge. Even the very system of our thought are incomplete, as Godel and Kant has argued. If such thing were possible: that a man can be a God, then theoretically Muhammad PBUH will become a God in himself, because of an assumption that Man can reach a finality. But that’s not what we were seeing. We see him, despite the Guidance that has given by God, and all of these revelations that was entrusted upon us, we still unable to reach a desired state and ideal of a history period. The Prophet had leave our world, entrusted ourselves with his teaching. But how come we strive towards God if the one guiding us are already left?
Is it our fault that we won’t be a God? Is this our destiny for us to strive like Sisyphus? God is unreachable yet we were told to strive towards Him. We cannot claim finality but are entrusted with the responsibility to strive asymptotically toward justice, even knowing we will never fully reach it. One would make a claim that this journey is meaningless from the start. It is rigged from the moment it is existed.

But here, in this paper, the Writer would argue that, precisely because limitations and problems itself are inherent within this system, there exists infinite space for growth, by God’s will, granting humanity the freedom to choose between progress or regression indefinitely. And thus, we will introduce to you, a Structured Incompleteness, the Nature of the Divine, Revelation, and Human Knowledge, and what should we do to strive towards in these infinite possibilities.

1.1. Structured Incompleteness and Not-All

Reality for a Man is neither a closed system nor an arbitrary flux. Instead, it consists of structured incompleteness. The Not-All ensures that no ideology, science, or theological doctrine can fully encapsulate the Reference, yet asymptotic movement toward it or away from it remains possible.

To prove that, first, we need to explain what is Not-All, and how it relates to Structured Incompleteness? And What even is Structured Incompleteness?

We took the concept of Not-All (pas-tout) from Lacanian Psycho-Analysis , where he was influenced by mathematical logic, particularly Gödel's incompleteness theorem, which proves that no formal system can be both complete and consistent—there are always truths that escape formal proof. He applies this logic to human understanding, showing that no symbolic system (language, ideology, law, or even knowledge itself) can fully account for reality. He challenges the idea of a fully defined universal set. Lacan develops this idea within his formulas of sexuation, particularly to describe the feminine position, which does not conform to the universal logic of the phallic function.

In classical Aristotelian logic, universality is determined by whether a statement applies to "all" members of a category. However, Lacan's "Not-all" suggests that the set of all women does not exist as a complete, totalized whole. This is because the feminine position escapes full symbolic determination, implying an open-ended, structurally incomplete field. Instead of saying "all women are X," Lacan's Not-all means "there is no universal category that fully determines all women."
He particularly criticized the idea of Aristotelian concept of Universal, in which it is determined whether a statement applies to 'all' member of a category.

1. The masculine position (Phallic Function) operates under the logic of totalization: it tries to fit everything within the symbolic order, governed by the phallic function (meaning, law, identity).
2. The feminine position, however, is "Not-All" (pas-tout)—not fully enclosed by the phallic function, meaning that it remains open to something beyond, an excess that escapes totalization.

Now let's see this on principle. We would then examine the thought experiment of Münchhausen trilemma to demonstrate theoretical impossibility of proving any truth, even in the fields of logic and mathematics, without appealing to accepted assumptions. If it is asked how any given proposition is known to be true, proof in support of that proposition may be provided. Yet that same question can be asked of that supporting proof, and any subsequent supporting proof. The Münchhausen (or Agrippean) trilemma is that there are only three ways of completing a proof. Suppose one may ask:'what is an apple?'. Then, you would be provided with only three different ways to answer it:

1. Suppose you would argue that: 'an apple is a fruit that is red'. But the skeptic who asked then would question: 'why an apple must be

a fruit and is red? how about a green apple?'. Then, you would be challenged to answer it again: 'so yes, an apple can be green. An Apple is a fruid because we can eat it and it grows on nature.'. then, the skeptics will come with another question of why that is, and you would then be challenged to respond again, and again, and again.… —it would then become a barrage of never-ending regression of why something is. Then, by the rule of logic, its truth cannot be claimed.

2. Suppose then you would say that:'an apple Is an apple because I Said So. Why? Because it is an apple!' then, if you think it would suffice then it means that your preposition itself is as valid as someone who would say 'an apple is a durian that has lost its spikes and turns red because of my blood and are harmful to eat'. By this, a circular argument then wouldn't suffice to claims the truth.
3. Then you would remain with an answer that's dogmatic, that is: 'It is an apple, not because I know that it is an apple, but because I believe that it is apple. It must be something, but I wouldn't know'. Then, the skeptics then would leave, unsatisfied with the answer that you had provided.

One had failed to answer the question until they manage to answer the why-question in a way that falls into none of the three options. Unless that happens, there is no reason to assume that they have given any justification whatsoever, and indeed there Is no reason to assume that any justification whatsoever is available.

Let's see an example on how this would work in another situation. A king has decided that everyone would be a subject to his rule (∀x Φx: "All things are subject to his law"). But there is an exception of that, that is, the King who had decided the rule himself (∃x ¬Φx: "There exists an exception. The king who's above the law). But then this would create a problem, that is: 'who decides that That king should be an exception? And then who decided that That rule that the king should be an exception? And who decided……' towards infinite regression. Then it must be the case that it cannot be a completely external rule that's never ending and results in infinite regression. Is this mean the King claims that based on his own word? 'I am the King because I Said so'? Then that rule itself is as valid as his serf who can said 'I am the king instead of Him who sits on the throne'. Thus, the system, by its inherent structure itself, is incomplete: it is always has an excess that cannot be resolved, but somehow allowing the system to exist in the first place. This is the feminine position that's always

lacking. This is the Lack that is mentioned. A system cannot be a a total binary, i.e. Between this and that thing; A rule with a subject that's an exception to that rule. It cannot be, because otherwise, it would fall down. It must always have an excess for it to exist in the first place, not in a binary system but transcend it. (Notall x Φx: The System points Beyond itself)

Now that we had defined what is a Not-All, we can recognize that Every System there is, must be Incomplete. Because its own existence cannot derive its justification from external means, and also from the internal means. A Kingdom cannot claim that it is already perfect and complete, because then there would be a question of: Who decided that That kingdom can claim that it is already complete? If it then would be answered that the justification comes from external (e.g. God or Power), then the question would occurs again: 'What does determine those entity to make a rule like that, and then so on, and so on; and if the answer to the first question is because 'I Said So' or something similar, then it would be the case that it doesn't mean anything. King's serf then able to, for example, to claim that "The Kingdom is Flawed" and it would still be as valid as the first claim that the Kingdom is perfect. This is a structured Incompleteness that permeates in all system of language and reason itself, and therefore, also into Politics and Government, and even on the case of individual. There's an inherent need for something to fill that Lack, yet it remains unknowable for them because the Real, something would fill that gap, is in itself beyond logics and human reason.

The Prima Causa, the root of all things, are inherently unreachable for the human being. Its very system itself is flawed. Then how come we can able to strive towards it? When the very system of a man is unable to reach the truth, then why bother striving? Is this journey meaningless in the first place? Are we can actually strive towards something tangible and reachable? To answer that, we will begin to delve into the section of ontology, where we'll discuss about the nature of God, the Revelation, and our knowledge that is incomplete. And perhaps from these discussions, we will see why a progress is not merely a meaningless journey, but a journey which shaped by our own choices, and how these progress matter at all, even though incomplete.

1.2. Movement

Now, because of these lack, a tension are happening as Men cannot attain the full truth; yet They are submitted to it, living their life

chasing the ‘truth; unable to reach for it fully, as Men cannot be a God. Men are given a choice between chasing for it, abolish all means of journey, or even reject all form of journey itself to rebel against these ‘Truth’. Men are creature that is bound to always making a closed system, trying to have a system that would explains everything while accounting every variables and analysis. That is because of Men’s nature of finding their purpose in Life; as they need something to justify why are they still living and striving in the first place. Else, men are destined to face the uncanny truth that maybe they won’t ever get an answer.

We had knows that because of these Incompleteness Structures, one cannot attain the truth at all. Thus, humanity are met with two possible choices. Either A. They decided to stagnate and abolish all means of progression, or B. Despite of these limitation, Men will stay collecting any pieces of information and discovery for it is their passion to do so. Either a sublation from dialectics towards or away from any point, or that they will decide to leave all means of dialectics movement. This, of course, has its impact in both individual and societies alike. The one who stagnates will definitely be weaker among those who has progressed; and the one who had regressed will definitely worse than those who has stagnated. A man that wont learn, will definitely worse than men that is learning, for he has better option to choose and will grow. Even in the realm of evolution themselves, those Sapiens that didn’t develop the ability of thought and communication, will falter to those who can. It is a battle for the fittest. So despite the fact that we cannot attain the full truth, these progresses of humanity showed us that there is a movement in history itself. Now, a movement is not possible if there’s no point in which we can reference those movement. We wont know a point of whether one is closer or further away from, if there’s not a kind of an absolute point for us to reference which and which. Whether someone is closer to farther from their houses, for example, must necessitate the existence of the house as the point of reference to decide. Else, the hierarchy of those who had learned and those who are not are placed in the same status; despite they are clearly having a different abilities and freedom. A man that is not free is very different from those who had ‘known’ the truth or the road ahead. A blind man are different from those who can see. Thus, it must be the case that the progress of Humanity are having an absolute point in which we can referencing when we judge and value whether one are better and worse. From there, we can determine that human does have its freedom in which he can choose between stagnation, progress, or regress in the history

of humanity; therefore explaining why a man is better than the other, and why some societies survive better than the most of its peers. Thus, in this case, we will examine what could be the nature of these ‘References’ and where does it came from, and in proving How humanity can chooses its option to either sublimated towards or away from something, or that they’ll choose to stagnates. We will examine the Nature of the Divine, The References, and Human Knowledge itself in regards to the References, and how there’s a clear movement in history because of that.

2. Ontology: The Structure of Reality & The Reference

In this section, the writer want to introduce the nature of Reality, the Divine in itself, the Revelation as an excess to the system, and Human’s approximation of the Revelation. They are different in each way. God transcend all of things; Revelation are truth, but partial truth that cannot be changed in itself, and are eternal; and Human interpretation of it is an attempt to approximate the Divine Law by not changing it. There’s 3 hierarchy here, as God in itself are way beyond all things and sustains the very reality, the very source of all things; His revelation act as an excess to human system; the feminine, maintaining the possibilities of an asymptotic growth of human understanding; the masculine.

2.1. The Nature of the Reference & The Ruler

2.1.1. The Divine

The Divine is completely beyond structured reality—beyond language, beyond containment, beyond conceptualization. Al-Ghazali affirms absolute transcendence (tanzīh), maintaining that God cannot be enclosed within human thought or systems. Al-Junayd follows this principle but allows for a gradual unveiling of divine presence through spiritual purification.

Ibn Arabi, however, complicates this further—while God is beyond all existence, He also manifests in all things as divine self-disclosure (tajalli). This creates a paradox: God is unknowable, yet His presence is experienced in structured manifestations. How then? If god is purely transcendental, then how come we can exists at all? Are God simply an existence which beyond us fully, then is it the case that He doesn’t grant this existence to us? Meddling with our very fabric of reality? But if God is inside the system, then are God ‘needing’ something to exist? An existence which needs something else for him to get allowed to exists in this system? Then are we saying that the system is greater than

God? For that, there’s a necessity in differencing between His existence in itself, and His revelation.
For us, God is the Absolute Beyond—He cannot be fully enclosed within any theological, mystical, or philosophical system. However, divine presence manifests as structured excess—while God Himself remains unknowable, He emanates structured guidance into reality. God is neither within nor outside the system—He is the sustaining excess that allows the system to exist but also eludes total containment within it. The Real (al-Haqq) is beyond all structures, yet it unveils itself in excess as a Revelation, always escaping full comprehension.

Because the Divine is beyond total human comprehension, it does not simply impose itself as absolute presence but instead emanates structured guidance in the form of The Reference. However, this transmission is not a perfect closure of divine truth —it remains an excess, resisting full containment. Thus, the act of revelation does not remove uncertainty; it introduces a tension between divine clarity and interpretive openness. The Divine is absolutely beyond comprehension, yet it manifests through excess in reality. This means God is both present and absent—we are drawn toward the Real but can never fully reach it. The tension of which, it manifest within a Structured Incompleteness; where the knowledge of a Man would never reach His full divininty.

One may would ask: what is the nature of God himself in regards to this structure? Is it necessary that He sustain this structure of the world or reality as it is? Or is it His will that he created this structure? In then we would answer: It is by His Will that the world exists, not necessarily. That is because, if it necessary for God to create the world, then God is a subject to something else that has determined that God has to be; it would then mean that God is inside the Masculine Position and thus we will see that God will falls in the same manner as what we had argued before. God is Incomprehensible by human standard. Thus, it should be the case that God remain in the Beyond the structure, and its revelation are inside the Feminine position. The God himself are beyond the structured incompleteness, and its revelation occupies the excess of that system; sustaining the system transcendently by His will, but also immanently within that system by His will also. He must be beyond logic; surpassing the logic system and structured incompleteness itself to support that

system, while also paradoxically remains within that system itself with his manifestation. He is purely ‘beyond’ the system to sustains it from external position; yet his manifestation also act as an excess inside the system itself. By His will, God Supports the system through his manifestation from within; remains transcendent and without limitation of the reality. Now, we can see that God’s ‘emanation’ is not a necessary for Him; as if, God is not a subject to something else to necessitate him to supports the system, but rather, he is the subject to himself that’s beyond.

In this regard, the existence of the system is in His Will rather than out of necessity; and that he can stop the structure of existence itself if he had willed to do so. This is aligned with al-Ghazali’s critique against Islamic Metaphysical Neo-Platonism, where the likes of Ibn Sina and Ibn Farabi see a God as if it is mechanical existence that must necessarily sustain the reality as if God were subject to something else; when in reality, it is by His Will the world occurs, and by His Will also that the world may not exist. It is by His Will also that he may emanate his influence to create and sustains the world and also meddling in the affairs of world he had created. This is where a Prophet, Sufi, Revelation, etc. would become some of His sign of His unexplainable influence within the world; that is exist within the world yet exceeding its reality in itself; carrying the universal truth in a way that is eternal and inexplainable in its totality, yet his Revelation still can be used as a measure of Reference for Human progress and wisdom. A revelation that is approachable and accessible to Mortal, yet also unreachable in its fullness.

God are the only perfect and complete reality, while humanity, by divine decree, exists within a structured yet limited system. By design, human beings will never escape the truth nor they will have a full access of divine truth or reach the finality of the Divine —not due to external restriction, but because the very structure of existence prevents total closure.

Human beings will never attain divine perfection, for perfection belongs solely to God. Instead, they can only move toward or away from its Manifestation asymptotically, always engaging with the divine without ever fully grasping it or runs away from it. This movement is asymptotic—an infinite progression of partial approaches and regressions, never reaching absolute completion.

Human agency operates within the limits decreed by God's Will, not out of necessity but by divine choice. The journey of ethical and spiritual refinement is thus not a linear progression but a dynamic, evolving process within the constraints of limited freedom—a freedom willed by God rather than dictated by external necessity.

"Everyone turns to their own direction 'of prayer'. So compete with one another in doing good. Wherever you are, Allah will bring you all together for judgment. Surely Allah is Most Capable of everything."
QS. 2:158

"And you cannot escape Him on earth or in heaven. Nor have you any protector or helper besides Allah."
QS:. 29:22

"As for those who struggle in Our cause, We will surely guide them along Our Way. And Allah is certainly with the good-doers."
QS. 29:69

2.1.2. The Reference = Divine truth, ultimate knowledge, structured excess.

Because the Divine are beyond, the only thing we can say about all of these manifestation on these worlds are partial of His divine truth. Because else: if God were completely beyond, it cannot be the case that God still unable to interact with us. That interaction can be understood as why are we exists here in the first place? How does God interact with the world? These revelations are possible explanation on why God were able to interact with the world. So now, we then move on, to discuss the nature of the Divine's Revelation.

Because the Divine is beyond all categories, it cannot impose itself in direct form but must emanate structured guidance. However, this emanation cannot fully capture the infinite—hence, revelation emerges as an excess, pointing toward the Real without enclosing it.

Let's take a look again at the Not-All argument; it states that a system cannot be a binary and closed; there must be something that is incomplete in Human system, and provide the existence of the system in the first place. Because if God is only beyond, He becomes inaccessible. If He is fully present, then He collapses

into the world. Thus, Revelation (The Reference) emerges as an attempt to mediate this paradox.
We will now, tries to prove that the Divine exist on both of the world; both Transcendent, and Immanent; Both in it rule, and outside the rule; that There's nothing like him in this sense, and why Reason and symbol (binary) cannot comprehend God. This aligns with the likes of Sufism, particularly Ibn Arabi and al-Ghazali.

Let's get back to the argument of the King. He may reason that: 'the Divine has chosen me as your King, so all the subject must obey the King's law; in exception the King himself.'
Then the question would be that: 'Why? Is there a reason why God chooses you? Is that required for him to choose you?' Then the king would have to answer that. If he somehow answer with something along the line of:
'well, I am Rich; I am Strong; I have good Personalities'
Then the question results will be: 'well, are you implying that God are subject to that? Then does that mean God must chooses someone based on their Wealth and Strong? What decide that God must chooses based on those? Are there any other God higher that He is? If that's the case then who is the even higher God from that? And so on, and so on.' Then, it would result in an infinite amount of never-ending question that would never have an end point. This is contradicting the law of reasoning itself, as there cannot be the case that That claim is correct when it itself is based on an infinite regression.

An other possibilities then, would be:
'well, I Am the God.'
Then the question would be that: 'So Truth is arbitrary? No inherent meaning of eternal Justice like what you had claimed? You claim that your truth is eternal yet if it changes according to your whims, then it is not an eternal in a sense, because it can change across history by your whims.' In this case, the truth that is claimed by someone inside the system will be inherently flawed, as it will be as valid as his subject that will claim that 'The Truth is that you are not a God'. This would mean it contradicts the very nature of its claim, that his truth is eternal, and that it is universal and applicable to all history; because there would be no meaning in one way or the other.

Thus, how can we resolve this? If the Revelation is something which we cannot attain fully, then how come we were able to strive towards it? We cannot get a full glimpse of what has God meant by this revelation, as His Will is beyond our comprehension? And since the nature of God's Revelation is a partial truth that it cannot be comprehended by Human Reason or fully known with it; then how come we can ever know God's nature in itself Fully? It is not the case that the Revelation is a Divine, as it is Equal. Nay! If the Divinity of God that is sustaining all of reality is the Same as its Revelation, then surely we may as well worship Muhammad PBUH; since the revelation is the same as the truth. But surely it would be a total heresy! a revelation is merely a revelation; a partial truth that while cannot encapsulate the Divine fully, still valid as an excess of reality. It must be the case then, that our knowledge, although can be develop, still in need for perpetual refinement and sublimation towards the justice and never reaching it. Thus, the revelation cannot be changed, but only human's interpretation are; The Reference act as an excess for any system there is, guiding us to always improve ourself in our ethical and epistemic development.
The Reference is a Revelation. It is structured yet infinite—it provides a stable foundation, but its interpretation unfolds asymptotically. The Quran is both a reference and an excess—it guides toward divine truth but is never a total enclosure of it. Revelation itself does not change, but its understanding must be continuously refined through dialectical engagement.
Revelation is a structured light emanating from the Divine, yet it always contains an excess—an opening for deeper meaning beyond static interpretation.
Human will always find himself lacking to comprehend God's Words; it is as if His Revelation resides inside the excess of the system. So it must be the case that God in itself are even more far away. He is both Beyond, Transcendent to the system; but closer and inside the system at the same time; Emanating his influence to supports the system by his will, while also Manifest its revelation inside the system. His revelation act as an excess by his will also. As paradoxical as it is, it works because God is inherently paradoxical: meaning that God, as the creator or the system of Logic, must transcend that very logic and even Structured Incompleteness itself to exert His influence. He is Purely Transcendent, and its Revelation are manifesting withing the world, waiting for us to strive towards it, as incomplete as our understanding is.

Bellows is the few ayah that's state His Transcendence:

"Say that He is God, The One; One who is in need of none and of Whom all are in need; Neither begot any not was He begotten; and none is comparable to Him.'
QS: 112

"And whoever strives 'in Allah's cause', only does so for their own good. Surely Allah is not in need of 'any of' his creation"
QS: 29:6

Bellows is the few ayah that's state His Immanence:

"Indeed, 'it is' We 'Who' created humankind and 'fully' know what their souls whisper to them, and We are closer to them than 'their' jugular vein."
QS: 50:16

"And to Allah belongs the east and the west. So wherever you [might] turn, there is the Face of Allah. Indeed, Allah is all-Encompassing and Knowing."
QS: 2:115

In this regard, God is beyond logic; both manifest and hidden; or not even both at the same time; both within and beyond the system. His law is eternal, but it's unfolding in an open-ended process. Because else, if God is purely transcendent, it would mean that the Law of God is completely detached from reality itself; making revelation, ethics, and human understanding impossible. If God were purely immanent, the divine authority would be entirely absorbed into human interpretation, making it indistinguishable from Subjective Experience.

Now that we proved how God are both Transcendence in its nature and Immanent in its revelation, we can say that it is makes sense now, that the Divine would be necessarily both Transcendence and Immanent; That is because, if God is purely transcendent both in its nature and revelation, it would also implied that the Law of God is completely detached from reality itself; making revelation, ethics, and human understanding impossible. Else, if God were purely immanent, the divine

authority would be entirely absorbed into human interpretation, making it indistinguishable from Subjective Experience. Then, we will now focus on how the Divine would manifest into reality and interact with it, with also being transcendent and immanent.

God has Revealed a law, and that is, for the writer himself: it is a Quran; and he also sent his prophet and mystics to guide human in their progression of ethics and knowledge. But we will particularly concerned with the nature of Quran, or in this case, the Divine Reference Point.

So what is a Divine Reference Point? It defined as: an Universal guides or Reference, that would decide the proximity of an organism in its alignment to the Divine. It would function as an unreachable metaphysical ruler that judge whether an entity (e.g. individual or society) is more stable and Just than the other. It functions as the mediating structure; it is the point where the transcendent becomes immanent without collapsing into either extreme. It is not God in itself, but it is also not entirely separate from God (the Quran is Kalamullah and it is Qadim). It is the structured Reference point that allows divine authority to interact with the world.

One Interpretation would be that the Reference are inside the Masculine Universal+Exception Structure; or that it operates under the logic of totalization: it tries to fit everything within the symbolic order, governed by the phallic function (e.g. language, meaning, symbol, etc). This would mean that the Reference serves as fully-closed structure that take exception in itself to grounds divine authority in a way that’s remains transcendent while also accessible to humans. It is a necessary external reference that allows divine law to exist within this system without harming its inherent trait of transcendence by His Will. It is Eternal and Universal (transcendence) that it is remains relevant across all history, yet also revealed in history of human progress (immanent). It acts as a Reference Point for human to decide whether this is ethical or not; or whether an organism gets closer to God’s will or regressing. Another example would be Prophethood; that in itself as a human, he is an Immanent, but he also receives Divine knowledge from beyond human limitations (transcendent).

However, this would create the same problem as stated above:

‘If the Reference is an external reference that decided all things and structure the Divine Law as a fully-closed structures, that requires no further interpretation because it is already perfect for symbolic Human comprehension of it, then who or what determines it?’

- If The the Reference is arbitrarily chosen, then it would mean that Divine Authority is unstable and not universal.
- If the Reference is necessary, then something external must determine it; leading to infinite regress.

This means that the Reference itself must contain an internal contradiction because it exists in the realm of symbol; and that is false. It must be the case that it is both necessary and open-ended.

It then would mean there is a second interpretation, that is: the Reference must position itself in the Feminine Not-All Structure. the Reference cannot be fully closed structure because Divine Law itself cannot fully enclose divine reality.
Instead, the system must have an excess that ensures it remains incomplete, open-ended, and unfolding. the Reference are already ‘complete’ in itself, but it only a partial truth. The ‘Reference’ and ‘the Idea of the Reference: the Ruler’ are separate things, while ‘God’ are the full truth, and ‘Revelation’ are partial but unchangeable truth, human idea of the Revelation itself would never be complete, but can be striven towards. This means that prophethood, revelation, and divine guidance are not static; they are structured yet always exceeding their own boundaries.
The Quran is ‘complete’, but it leaves room for continuous interpretation. Prophet Mohammed PBUH is the “Seal” of prophethood, but mysticism and divine still shaping and drive the human alongside the divine reality. Ethical progress and historical change shows that Divine Law is not a fixed totality, but a dialectical unfolding.
Now, let’s try using Lacan’s logic of the Universal and Exception vs. the Notall, we can categorize theological views of the Reference into two structures:

1. Masculine Structure (Universal + Exception):
    - the Reference is a total system that contains divine law and guidance (∀x Φx: "All things are subject to divine revelation").

- However, God as the revealer is outside this system, standing as an exception that determines it but is not contained by it (∃x ¬Φx: "There exists an exception, the One who is beyond the law itself").
    - This supports the Ash‘arite claim that the Reference (e.g. Qur’an) is uncreated, as it exists eternally with God.

2. Feminine Structure (Notall):
    - The the Reference is not all of divine speech; it is a manifestation of a larger, infinite divine knowledge (Notall x Φx).
    - The the Reference reveals, but also points beyond itself, implying that divine reality exceeds textual expression.
    - This supports the Mu‘tazilite claim that the Reference is created because its historical revelation is contingent and finite.

“If all the trees on earth were pens and the ocean were ink, refilled by seven other oceans, the Words of Allah would not be exhausted. Surely Allah is Almighty, All-Wise.”
QS. 31:27

Closed systems claim total possession of truth and lead to stagnation. Pure open-ended systems risk relativism and chaos. We then unite both—truth exists, but human engagement with it is always an unfolding journey. Thus, the Reference is both Structured and Incomplete; it is a fixed reference point that is always points beyond itself. Revelation is fixed, but its realization is dialectical. Justice is eternal, but its application is historical. The human progress towards Divine Order would never be complete or that they’ll ever arrive; but they can always strive towards it asymptotically. Thus, the room for growth is infinite, leaving human with a choice between progress, stagnation, or even regress. The Reference (Revelation) is a fixed text, but its meaning is excessive and unfolds asymptotically. It provides guidance, yet its excess prevents total closure, meaning interpretation must always evolve. Because if revelation is fully enclosed in law, it loses excess and becomes rigid. If it is totally open, it dissolves into boundless relativism. This leads to the necessity of The Ruler, who attempts to enclose interpretation.

2.1.3. The Ruler

The Reference, being structured yet excessive, demands interpretation. It act as an excess, refuses full closure. It demands interpretation—but interpretation itself is a paradox. The moment an interpreter fixes meaning, they move away from the excess that defines divine truth. Thus, The Ruler arises, attempting to enclose what is structurally uncontainable. But this act of structuring divine meaning creates an unavoidable paradox: human interpretation seeks to enclose divine guidance, yet it remains inherently incomplete. The Ruler (whether scholar, jurist, or political authority) attempts to fix meaning, but in doing so, risks claiming a finality that contradicts structured incompleteness. Since the Reference is the Real, an excess within the system that can never be fully fulfilled; It will always remain in the Feminine position (Not-All), meaning it is never fully totalized. This is why divine truth is eternal, yet human can strive inside of it through Dialectics. The process of which, that the human understanding are dialectically sublimed towards the Reference.

But then the question remains, if the Reference is an unconceivable light or guidance, then how can one know whether they progress towards or regress away from? If the Reference (the Divine Word) is eternal, then is should be fully present at all times; unchanging and absolute. But if we can get closer or further away from it, that means there is a difference in our relationship with it over time. This would suggest that divine truth is not simply ‘there’ in a fixed way; rather, it has an emanative power structure. Are they changed in position or something similar?

The answer would be that, the Divine Word itself does not change, but our capacity to perceive, engage, and embody it does. We then introduce a two concept, between the Reference and the Ruler. While a Reference is divine; a Ruler is human an approximation of the Reference.
This means that the Truth is not just static object, but an unfolding relationship; one that involves distances and proximity; not a spatial one but ontological one. This is exactly what emanation explains; the more further something is away from the source, the less “Real” it becomes.

Let’s see an example. A concept of Justice is always a relevant topic across human history. The concept of Justice is also stated in the Reference, or in this example, the Qur’an. One should strive towards it, it says. After that, one would maybe for example, suggests that ‘Justice means that everyone receives the same treatment’; then, it dialectically challenged by other person who’ll say that ‘Justice means everyone receive a different treatment according to their vice or wisdom’, but everything can be approximated because that justice itself Is a thing, and we reference those when we invoke it. Sure, all of them would leave some kind of ‘oppression’ and discrimination, but one of them should be closer to the Reference rather than not. This is the Law of Excluded Middle in logic; now, let’s say in this example, the latter wins by stating ‘different justice for different situation, not the same treatment for everyone’. They would be closer because, there’ll be less oppression; although still exists in one way or another, but they definitely progress towards the Divine Justice, as smallest as it is. It would result in more stability of a system than the first concept of ‘same treatment’. The Latter has fewer contradiction and problems within its system, while the First has more of it. This, ‘human sense’ (for a lack of a better word), of less contradiction is corelated by its proximity towards Divine Justice. The more just a system is, the closer it is towards the Reference. The sign of it is: how many contradictions it has in its system; and how the system addresses their Lack compared to any other system? This is an approximation of the proximity of a system in regard to the Reference.
Once revelation is established, it must be interpreted and applied by human beings, leading to the emergence of religious scholars, legal authorities, and rulers who structure divine law.

Al-Ghazali, emphasize that the scholars are to interpret divine law, and their rulings must be followed, ensuring continuity of religious authority. Ibn Arabi, on the other hand, argues that True authority belongs to the Perfect Human (al-Insan al-Kamil), who embodies direct divine wisdom beyond structured legalism. Then, Al-Junayd, Balances the two—mystical insight refines human understanding, but legal structures remain necessary.

The Ruler (scholars, legal authorities) operates under the masculine function—it seeks to enclose divine truth within a structured system. However, the Ruler is structurally incomplete —no scholar, ruler, or theologian can fully encapsulate divine law.

The moment any authority claims finality, it moves away from divine truth—human law must remain open to critique and refinement. The Ruler enforces structure, but when it claims totality, it becomes an illusion. The Divine remains beyond all enclosures, continuously breaking through static authority. This hierarchical structure ensures that The Divine remains beyond structured incompleteness—it is never fully enclosed; The Reference is an excess—it is structured but requires asymptotic refinement over time; The Ruler attempts to enclose divine law but must always remain subject to critique. Because else, if authority is treated as final, it suppresses dialectical refinement and moves away from the Real. If authority is too weak, interpretation collapses into chaos. Thus, asymptotic refinement is needed as a continuous dialectical process.

The Ruler, as the enforcer of divine law, attempts to totalize what remains fundamentally open. Yet every totalization moves away from the Real. Thus, the only way to approach divine truth is through an asymptotic movement—where interpretation is continuously refined, without ever collapsing into finality.

2.2. Link to Theological Traditions (Al-Ghazali, Ibn Arabi, Occasionalism)

2.2.1. Why does divine truth remain inaccessible?

Now, since we have described the nature of the Divine, Revelation, and Human progress, it would be clear that Human will never reach a full understanding of His Reference. It would then may be asks, why every progress will never reach a finality? Why does its asymptotic in contrast with symptotic? The question would be, that the very system or basic framework itself, in which human work with the environment around him, is inherently lacking in itself, because that human system is a closed-system, meaning, on its very structure it is contradictory in itself. The limitation arises from the fundamental limitations within the structure of human knowledge itself. Unlike a fully enclosed system that could, in principle, resolve all contradictions within it, human epistemic frameworks, the Ruler, are necessarily incomplete, lacking the capacity to fully encapsulate absolute truth. This limitation stems from the fact that any closed system of human understanding contains inherent contradictions, making totalization impossible. In this sense, progress is not merely a failure to "arrive" at truth but an intrinsic feature of human cognition, where every solution generates new contradictions,

pushing thought and knowledge toward refinement without ever achieving total closure. This idea is not just a metaphysical assertion but is supported by multiple philosophical and logical critiques of epistemic totality

In here, we will try explore in proving why would the knowledge of human will have its limitation that can never be resolved logically. We'll take an argument from al-Ghazali's critique of Philosophy; Kantian System, and Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem.

2.2.2. How does revelation function as structured excess?

the Divine is absolute Real, it is eternal and unchanging; and it's manifestation as a Reference are partial but also unchangeable. However, emanation means that creation exist at varying 'distance' from the Real. This 'distance', is not spatial but ontological; Things further from the Real have less of its presence.

A metaphor would be that, God create a Sun that emanates light; there is no break between the sun and its rays. But the further you are from the sun, the less heat and light you would experience. The sun itself is always shining, but your experience of it changes based on your position. Similarly, the Divine Word is always eternal, but human perception, ethics, and knowledge of it can be closer or further away. We do experience movement towards or away from the Reference, in terms of ethical, epistemic, existential, and spiritual shift; but it is not a fixed object, but rather, an Universal Reference that's incomprehensible in its totality, but still can be approximated. We can always make and refines a better Ruler; an approximation of it, but we will never arrive at it in finality. the Reference is not a point inside the system, but it is an excess, something both beyond and within the structure.

It would be said then, why distance from the Reference creates corruption? The best theory the writer had is, that if something is further away from the Real, it lacks divine presence. This Lack is what we call "evil"; not a positive and autonomous force other than goodness, but a privation, an absence of divine fullness (Maimonedes). The closer something is to the Real, the more fully it embodies divine truth. So 'Evilness' in itself is not a 'Thing', but a degree of absence. Just like cold is the absence of heat;

darkness is the absence of light; evil is the absence of divine presence. It is not an independent force, but rather a condition of being further from the emanating source. When one moves ‘closer’ to the Reference, reality becomes coherent, integrated, and aligned with divine presence, although not perfectly, but better. On the other hand, when one moves ‘away’ from the Reference, experience becomes fragmented, chaotic, and lacking in divine presence.

This can also explain why Jouissance occurs more often as they regress further away from the Reference, and also the opposites; because the Lack between the Real and Ego that is still bound by its Symbol, demands satisfaction to fulfill the ever-increasing existential Gap. It cries for sustenance and fulfillment, yet the Symbolic order and/or Ego that’s regressing away from the Real prevent the availability of the means of pleasure and stability. Thus, an excess desire that’s unfulfilled results in Jouissance inside the system.

2.3 Bridge to Epistemology

Since the Reference is always beyond full human grasp, knowledge must be approached dialectically.

3. Epistemology: How Knowledge Progresses & Stagnates

3.1. Introduce Lacanian & Dialectical Concepts (Condensed into one section)

- 3.1.1. The Not-All → Structured incompleteness (There is no final totality).
- 3.1.2. Jouissance → The human drive to fill incompleteness, leading to ideological illusions.
- 3.1.3. The Big Other → False totalities that people rely on to escape structured incompleteness.

3.2. Modes of Engagement with the Reference

- 3.2.1. Asymptotic Progress → Refinement, sublation.
- 3.2.2. Ideological Closure → Stagnation, false certainty.
- 3.2.3. Regression & Illusion → Reinforcement of ideological fantasy.
- 3.2.4. Self-Annihilation (Fanā’) → The complete negation of the self into the Reference.

3.3. Smoothly transition into political & ethical implications by linking knowledge structures to ideological systems.

4. Ideology & The Political Structure of Knowledge

- 4.1. Critique of Ideological Closure (Žižek, Marx, Foucault)
  - 4.1.1. Why do systems resist epistemic progress?
  - 4.1.2. How does structured incompleteness challenge authoritarian structures?
- 4.2. Knowledge Regulation & Ethics (Al-Ghazali, Kant, Mill, & Political Philosophy)
  - 4.2.1. Who controls knowledge? How do we prevent tyranny while regulating access?
  - 4.2.2. How does dialectical refinement prevent ideological corruption?

5. Ethics & Rupture: How Stagnation is Broken

- 5.1. Clarify "Rupture" in One Section (Avoid Repetition!)
  - 5.1.1. Revolutionary Refinement → Rupture that leads to epistemic progress.
  - 5.1.2. Destructive Rupture → Collapse into nihilism or chaos.
- 5.2. Apply Rupture to Political & Theological Systems
  - 5.2.1. How should societies handle contradiction?
  - 5.2.2. Why dialectical refinement is better than blind revolution or authoritarian suppression?
- 5.3. Lead into the conclusion by asking whether structured incompleteness is a challenge or a divine gift.

6. Conclusion: The Role of Incompleteness in Knowledge & Being

- 6.1. Return to the original problem → Is structured incompleteness a failure or a necessary part of reality?
- 6.2. Explain how DDE integrates different disciplines (philosophy, theology, psychoanalysis, politics).
- 6.3. Leave the reader with an open-ended challenge → How does one navigate structured incompleteness?